



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,553	01/23/2002	In Chul Jeong	0465-0838P-SP	5490

2292 7590 04/25/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

STINSON, FRANKIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/052,553

Applicant(s)

JEONG ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 8-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4, 8, 9 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/1/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1746

1. In view of applicant's remarks filed April 1, 2005, the Final Rejection dated December 1, 2005 is hereby withdrawn in favor of the action that follows below.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 9, line 2, the phrase "the structure" is without proper antecedent basis.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone (U. S. Pat No. 2,864,175) in view of either O'Neil (U. S. Pat No. 2,608,769), Warhus (U. S. Pat No. 2,881,633), Kim et al. (U. S. Pat No. 5,983,420) or Czech (U. S. Pat No. 2,940,179).

Re claim 1, Stone is cited disclosing a washing machine comprising.

a first tub(3);

a second tub (2) disposed in the first tub;

at least one circulation duct (27, 44) operatively coupled with the first tub to receive air from the second tub, dehumidify the air and recirculate the dehumidified air back into the second tub to dry laundry in the second tub during a drying operation of the washing machine; and

a water supplying duct (60, 71, 80) for supplying external water to a part of the

Art Unit: 1746

inside of an inner wall of the at least one circulation duct to flow down the inner wall (see col. 5, lines 26-43) from said part and come in contact with air received in the duct to dehumidify the air in the at least one circulation duct, that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the water supplying duct supplying water to an *upper* part of the circulation duct. Given the arrangement of the duct (see fig. 1) in Stone with the circuit starting at the bottom of the tub as at 27, extending upwardly to the fan 41, the position of the duct (60, 71, 80) could be considered to meet the limitation of the "upper part", nonetheless, the patents to O'Neil (as at 124, see fig. 5), Warhus (as at 29, see fig. 1), Kim (as at 24, see fig. 1) and Czech (as at 78), are each cited disclosing that it is old and well known to position in a drying circuit/duct, a water supply in an upper part their respective circulation duct. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the position of the water supplying duct (60, 71, 80) in Stone, to be positioned in an upper part of the circulation duct as taught by either O'Neil, Warhus, Kim or Czech, for the purpose of increasing the length of time the moisture laden air from the tub, contacts/mixes with the cooling/condensing water, thereby increasing the amount of moisture removed from the air traveling there through. This effectively creates a longer/larger cooling surface area of the duct. Re claim 3, Stone discloses the fan (41) and heater (48). Re claim 4, Stone discloses the fan as a *sirocco* type fan. Re claim 20, Stone discloses the drain duct (55). Re claim 21, Stone discloses the spaced location as claimed. Re claim 22, Czech discloses the plurality of grooves (75).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japan'857.

Art Unit: 1746

Claim 8 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the plural helical grooves provided at an inner wall surface of the circulation duct. Japan'857 is cited disclosing a circulation duct have a helical groove therein. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Stone, to include a helical groove as taught by Japan'857, for the purpose of efficiently discharging a large volume of condensate. To employ a plurality of helical grooves is deemed to be a mere duplication or parts (see **MPEP 2144.04 REVERSAL, DUPLICATION OR RE-ARRANGEMENT OF PARTS**).

6. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either Fukumoto et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,282,928), Japan'296, Kadoya et al. (U. S. Pat No. 5,111,673) or Hirose et al. (U. S. Pat No. 5,074,131).

Claim 19 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the pulsator being operatively coupled to the first and second tubs. Fukumoto, Japan'296, Kadoya and Hirose are each cited disclosing the pulsator. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either Stone to include a pulsator as taught by either Fukumoto, Japan'296, Kadoya or Hirose since they are considered to be the equivalent to one another see (**MPEP 2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE**). Re claim 9, Fukumoto (see fig. 2, col. 6, lines 39-49) is cited disclosing external supply duct and fan.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1746

It is noted that upon the allowance of a generic claim the claims withdrawn as per the Election of Species, dated March 8, 2004, as per Office policy.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In George, Izeki, Jacobs, Pfeider, Pugh and Roh et al., note the washing, drying and/or dehumidifying arrangements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (572) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls



FRANKIE L. STINSON  
Primary Examiner  
GROUP ART UNIT 1746